

hence be valid — as a part of revisionary or other taxonomic work (i.e. where there is composite type material), never as a purely curatorial exercise. Mechanical lectotype designation can easily lead to designation of a less than ideal specimen from syntypes, and a syntypic series may be more representative of a taxon than a single lectotypè specimen. In conclusion, he strongly urged that Recommendation 74G of the proposal be transformed into a mandatory provision.

In a further communication (23 April 2002), Prof Kraus commented that Article 78.3.2 of the Code strictly applies to Declarations that clarify the Code. In his opinion, deletion of Article 74.7.3 must qualify as a major change and not just a clarification.

In voting against the proposal, Dr Cogger (17 April 2002) said that he was also against any changes to Article 74.7.3. He stated the primary purpose of this Article was to ensure that lectotype designations be made only for taxonomic purposes. While it has been argued that this is nearly always the purpose of lectotypification, experience would suggest otherwise. Lectotypes are often chosen arbitrarily and with consequent serious disruption to nomenclatural stability and universality. Such disruptions most often occur when lectotypes are designated as a result of the routine curatorial publication of catalogues such as type lists, or of regional or global 'checklists' that are compiled primarily from secondary sources. The utility of such publications can be seriously compromised by the nomenclatural problems they create because of inappropriate lectotype designations.

He further stated that while he would be happy to support any changes to the Article that clarify its purpose and application, he did not support a proposal that reduces the essential taxonomic purpose of lectotypification to a mere Recommendation.

In voting against the proposal, Prof Mawatari (April 2002) said that he strongly supported retention of the Article as it currently stands. He stressed that the taxonomic purpose of lectotype designations should be clearly explained in revisionary works, particularly for readers who are not taxonomists.

Although over two-thirds of the Commissioners were in agreement with the wording of draft proposal (and accepted it as a minor change for clarification), the draft is published here to allow further comments from the Commission and the zoological community at large before it is brought to formal vote.

Comments on this draft proposal are invited and should be sent to the Executive Secretary, I.C.Z.N., c/o The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk) before 28 February 2003.

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Bolboceras* Kirby, 1819 (July) (Insecta, Coleoptera) over *Odonteus* Samouelle, 1819 (June)
(Case 3097; see BZN 59: 246–248)

Phillip J. Harpootlian

206 Fredericksburg Drive, Simpsonville, SC 29681, U.S.A.

I write in support of Case 3097, but make the following exceptions to the statement in para. 3 that the name *Odonteus* was not used between its original publication and its use by Krell in 1990. The name *Odonteus* Samouelle, 1819 was used at least once in the primary literature before 1990 with the original spelling and including the

nominal species *O. armiger* Scopoli, 1772 (see Jessop, 1986). Since 1990, Baraud (1992) used *Odontaeus* Samouelle, with the correct authorship and date, citing Krell (1990) as the basis for this action. The use of the name *Odontaeus* is also being proposed for an up-coming volume in the *Fauna-Iberica* series:

(www.fauna-iberica.mncn.csic.es/htmlfauna/faunibe/zoolist/insecta/coleoptera/geotrupidae.html).

Additional references

Baraud, J. 1992. *Coléoptères Scarabaeoidea D'Europe*. 856 pp. Faune de France 78, Federation Française des Sociétés des Sciences Naturelles.

Jessop, L. 1986. Dung beetles and chafers, Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea, vol. 5, part 11. 53 pp. *Handbook for the Identification of British Insects*. London.

Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of *Chrysodema* Laporte & Gory, 1835 and *Iridotaenia* Deyrolle, 1864 (Insecta, Coleoptera) by the designation of *C. sonnerati* Laporte & Gory, 1835 as the type species of *Chrysodema*
(Case 3193; see BZN 59: 185–187)

S. Bílý

Department of Entomology, National Museum, Kunratice 1, CZ-148 00 Praha 4, Czech Republic

The present situation where the two nominal genera *Chrysodema* Laporte & Gory, 1835 and *Iridotaenia* Deyrolle, 1864 both have the same type species, *C. sumptuosa* Laporte & Gory, 1835, is clearly contrary to the Code and complicates my research. Dr Bellamy's proposal to resolve the problem of synonymy by the designation of *C. sonnerati* Laporte & Gory, 1835 as the type species of *Chrysodema* has my full support.

Comment on the proposed conservation of 65 specific names in the family STAPHYLINIDAE Latreille, 1804 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 3207; see BZN 59: 99–113)

Andrew Wakeham-Dawson (Executive Secretary)

I.C.Z.N., clo The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk)

A few small errors have found their way into this application.

The Key to Table 1 should include the following:

— the senior homonyms marked with this symbol have not been used as valid names since at least 1899.

j.s. — means junior synonym.

Sentence (2)(a) of para. 4 should read: '(a) the **valid** specific names in column 4 of **Table 1 . . .**'.

Sentence (2)(b) of para. 4 should read: '(b) the specific names in column 2 of **Table 1 . . .**'.

The following sentence should be added: '(2)(c) **the specific names in column 2 of Table 2, as originally published in binomina with generic names in column 5.**'